



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/696,131	10/28/2003	Kang-Bok Lee	3364P100	5527
8791	7590	07/22/2008		
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP 1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040			EXAMINER	
			AGA, SORI A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2619	
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		07/22/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/696,131	Applicant(s) LEE ET AL.
	Examiner SORI A. AGA	Art Unit 2619

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 April 2008.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/0256/06)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's amendments and accompanying remarks, filed on 04/21/2008 have been entered and have been carefully considered. Claim 1 is amended. Claim 3 has been previously cancelled. Claims 1, 2 and 4-12 are now pending. In light of the amendment to claim 1, the objection to claim 1 is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

a. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 8 -12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kalman et al. (US 6,680,912) (herein after Kalman) in view of Kao et al (US 7,212,490) (herein after Kao) and Walrand et al. (US 6,711,125) (herein after Walrand).

Claim 8:

Kalman teaches when (if) all spans operational and un-degraded (neither ring is wrapped), data flows on the ring with lowest cost path [column 3 lines 1-3]

(a) computing (calculating) cost (transmission coefficient) for direction 0 and direction 1 (each ring) based on various factors including hop count [column 7 line 66- column 8 line 5].

(b) Kalman also teaches selecting a preferred direction (ring) with the lowest cost (transmission coefficient) for transmitting [column 7 lines 51-53].

However, Kalman does not explicitly teach transmission coefficient based on usage rate and/or delay time.

However, Walrand in the same field of endeavor teaches including transmission rate (usage rate) as a factor in determining preferable path (column 6 lines 46-50). Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to include transmission rate (usage rate) in the cost computation of Kalman in order to meet quality of service guarantees.

However, Kalman does not explicitly teach transmission coefficient based on delay time. However, Kao in the same field of endeavor teaches using a latency metric (delay time) for a given node for each ring. (Column 9 lines 46-52 and column 3 lines 12-13) to determine a preferred path. Therefore, It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to include latency (delay time) in the cost computation of Kalman in order to meet quality of service guarantees (column 2 lines 22-27).

Claim 9:

However, Kalman does not explicitly teach hop number and usage rate are determined with reference to a routing table. However, Kao in the same field of endeavor teaches hop count is included in each table of each node [column 10 line 22-29]. Kao also teaches shortest path determination is made based on this table [column 9 line 47]. Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to determine hop count and said usage rate based on data stored in a routing table in each node in order to have quick access to the information needed to make said ring selection.

Claim 10:

Kalman also teaches all nodes independently store current topology of the ring (topology map) [column 14 lines 63-65]. However, Kalman does not explicitly teach the topology map includes hop number, port information, MAC address and wrapped or not information.

However, Kao, in the same field of endeavor teaches a topology table including MAC addresses and hop count [column 10 line 22-29 - see also figure 5].

However, Cisco in the same field of endeavor teaches maintaining a topology map of the ring at every node including, MAC addresses, hop counts and wrapped or not information [pages 5 and 6]. Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to make Kalman's table include information on MAC address, wrapped or not information and inter-node hop numbers in order to be used in making routing decisions.

Kalman also teaches a preferred direction is included with in table 1 (topology table) [column 7 line 65]. The preferred direction entry (0 or 1) is considered to be port information because each node is connected to adjacent nodes by ring interface cards (ports) and each node (interface card) corresponds to each direction (0 or 1) [column 12 lines 52-53 – see also figure 6].

Claim 11:

Kalman also teaches each node determines (calculates) lowest cost path (transmission coefficient) for each of the nodes [column 3 line 7]. Kalman also teaches updating (storing) the calculated transmission coefficient in a preferred direction table – see table 1 (routing table) [colum8 line 46-47]. Kalman also teaches selecting a ring having a lowest transmission coefficient as discussed regarding claim 8 above.

Claim 12:

Kalman teaches calculating transmission coefficient and update routing table as discussed above regarding claim 8. However, Kalman does not explicitly teach updating is done periodically. However, Kao in the same field of endeavor teaches calculating and updating latency metric (transmission coefficient) periodically [column 10 lines 40-41 and column 5 line 23 - see also fig.5]. Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to calculate usage rate and transmission coefficient periodically and

update routing table accordingly in order to have updated information to be used in the ring selection process.

3. Claims 1,2 and 4-7 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kalman, Kao and Walrand as applied to claim 8 above and further in view of Applicant's own admission (herein after Admission).

Claim 1:

(Regarding claim 1- b, c and d), Kalman, Kao and Walrand together teach all the limitations of (b, c and d) as discussed above regarding claim 8 except comparing the usage rate and hop number of the selected path with reference values based a ring selection algorithm. However Kalman does not explicitly teach comparing the usage rate and hop number of the selected path with reference values based a ring selection algorithm.

However, Kao teaches comparing the ring selected based on shortest path (fewest hops) selection with ring selected using dynamic ring selection based on latency matrices indicative of congestion (ring selected based on transmission coefficient) [column 3 lines 53-54; column 3 lines 57-60; and column 3 lines 17-20]. It is inherent that comparing the references is done in order to determine which ring has more congestion. Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to compare usage rate and hop number with reference values of the ring selected with the dynamic ring selection in order to avoid creating more congestion by selecting a ring with an already high congestion.

(Regarding 1(a)) However, Kalman does not explicitly teach transmitting reception node address request message. However, Admission teaches that the transmission node (420) broadcasts (to all nodes) an ARP Request (reception node address request message) (step S401-figure 4). Admission also shows the routing table is updated with information regarding the shortest path. (Figure 4). Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to broadcast an ARP request in order to create and update topology table for each node.

Claim 2:

All the limitations of claim 2 are considered to be substantially the same as claim 9.

Claim 4:

However, Kalman does not explicitly teach determining if the two selected rings have the same reference value. However, Kao teaches using direction references [column 10 lines 56-57 - see also fig. 5]. Kao also teaches comparing the two selected rings as discussed above regarding claim 8. Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to compare the reference values in order to determine the path with the shortest path while avoiding overloading the same path.

Claim 5:

All the limitations of claim 1 are included in claim 5. The references teach all the limitations of claim 1 as discussed above regarding claim 1.

Kalman, Walrand and Kao together teach cost (transmission coefficient) determined with reference to hop count, usage rate and latency (delay time) as discussed regarding claim 8 above.

Claim 6:

All the limitations of claim 1 are included in claim 6. The references teach all the limitations of claim 1 as discussed above regarding claim 1. However, Kalman does not explicitly teach updating is done periodically. However, Kao in the same field of endeavor teaches calculating and updating latency metric (transmission coefficient) periodically [column 10 lines 40-41 and column 5 line 23 - see also fig.5]. Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to calculate usage rate and transmission coefficient periodically and update routing table accordingly in order to have updated information to be used in the ring selection process.

Claim 7:

All the limitations of claim 1 are included in claim 7. The references teach all the limitations of claim 1 as discussed above regarding claim 1. Kalman also teaches when a link failure is detected (wrapped path) the other ring is selected [column 3 lines 26-28].

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 04/21/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's argument relies upon the fairness algorithm as set forth in page 11 of applicant's specification [see last two lines of page 5 of applicant's remarks]. However, the feature upon which applicant relies (i.e., said fairness algorithm) is not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SORI A. AGA whose telephone number is (571)270-1868. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7:30-5:00, F 7:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chau T. Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-3126. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/S. A. A./
Examiner, Art Unit 2619

/CHAU T. NGUYEN/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2619